REMARKS

Status Of Application

Claims 1-29 are pending in the application; the status of the claims is as follows:

Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,768,604 to Yamazaki et al. ("Yamazaki") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,627,569 to Matsuzaki et al. ("Matsuzaki").

A Formal Replacement drawing for Fig. 18 was filed on January 28, 2004. Applicants respectfully request approval of the drawing.

Claim Amendments

Claim 11 has been amended to correct a punctuation error.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection

The rejection of claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Yamazaki in view of Matsuzaki, is respectfully traversed based on the following.

Yamazaki shows a process for operating a laptop computer where a sleep mode is entered after a predetermined period of inactivity. A timer is set to an initial value (72). A check is then made to determine if either keyboard activity has occurred (73) or video activity has occurred (75). If so, the timer is reset (74). If not, the timer is incremented (76). If the timer is greater than a specified value, the sleep or standby mode is entered (78). If not, the process loops back to check for keyboard or video activity.

Matsuzaki shows the use of ferro-electric liquid crystal displays (FLCD). These displays have the property of maintaining their state after power is removed (col. 1, lines 45-56). Because the display will be maintained at power-off, Matsuzaki shows a process

for erasing the display when a power-off command has been received (col. 5, line 62 – col. 6., line 29).

In contrast to the cited references, claim 1 includes:

> a controller which, in response to a command to turn off the electric power source which is issued while the display is performing writing by consuming electric power supplied from the electric power source, *turns off the electric power source after completion of the writing* without requiring a second command to turn off the electric power source; (*Italics added*)

The office action maintains that there is a power-off command that initiates the process of Figure 7 Yamazaki (page 3, paragraph 1). The reference does not support this assertion. The processes of Figures 5 and 7 are performed during the entire operation of the computer and shift the computer from a Normal (ON) 401 state to a Standby 402 state during a selected period of inactivity (Figure 4). The only power off command involved in these processes is 57 (Figure 5) or 78 (Figure 7).

In response to this, the Examiner asserts in the paragraph spanning pages 2 and 3 of the office action that the process of Figure 5 somehow triggers that of Figure 7.

> Yamazaki et al teaches on Column 5, lines 1-14 and lines 34-50 and depicts in Figure 5 that after no keys or actions are performed for a certain period of time a command to initiate "turning of the power" is initiated, this command is viewed by the examiner as the command to the program to leave subroutine (56) and enter subroutine (57). This command only occurs once. After the program enters subroutine (57) it executes the program depicted in Figure 7 and only turns off the power after the writing to the LCD is complete.

Applicants respectfully submit that this assertion is incorrect. Figure 5 shows "conventional" processing. Figure 7 shows Yamazaki *et al.*'s modification to the conventional processing by adding step 75 to check for video memory operations. As stated at column 5, lines 9-14 of Yamazaki:

> The present invention will now be described in detail while referring to FIGS. 6 through 8. FIG. 7 is a flowchart of the processing for the present invention with respect to the conventional processing in FIG. 5, for shifting the "normal on state" to the "standby state", performed by a personal computer.

The two operations stand alone and are examples of the same process. Neither process is initiated by a command to turn the power off, but rather are running throughout the operation of the computer as noted at column 4, lines 51-54:

> FIG. 5 is a flowchart of the processing, performed by a personal computer having the power saving states that are shifted as is shown in FIG. 4, for shifting the "normal on state" to the "standby state".

The only power off commands shown in Yamazaki are steps 57 and 78 at the end of those respective processes, and that implied by the power off state 404.

Even if it is conceded for the sake of argument that the process of Figure 7 is somehow triggered by a power-off command, the process still does not show all of the elements of the claim. Claim 1 requires that the device "turns off the electric power source after completion of the writing." When writing is detected in Yamazaki, the timer is reset at step 74. This begins an entirely new cycle of checking the keyboard and video operation. The process of Figure 7 has no way of determining if a particular writing process is completed. If another keystroke occurs, the timer will be reset. If another writing process occurs, the timer will be reset. The only thing that the process of Figure 7 determines is that there has been no keystroke or video memory write within a specified time. This does not show or suggest the limitations of the claim.

In addition, although Matsuzaki is only cited for the use of a bistable display, it none the less teaches to do a process completely incompatible with the claimed invention. Matsuzaki not only does not allow a screen writing to complete when a power off command is received, it initiates a process to erase the screen (col. 6, lines 23-25). Matsuzaki thus teaches away from the present invention.

To support a *prima facie* case for obviousness, the combined references must show or suggest every limitation of the claim. MPEP §2143.03. As noted above, the combination of Yamazaki and Matsuzaki does not show or suggest every limitation of claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is not obvious over the cited references. Claims 2-4 are dependent upon claim 1 and thus include every limitation of claim 1. Therefore, claims 2-4 are also not obvious over the cited references.

Also in contrast to the cited references, claim 5 includes:

> a delay process which, when the display is performing writing by consuming electric power supplied from the electric power source, delays execution of the automatic power-off process so that the electric power source is turned off after completion of the writing;

As noted above, the cited references do not show or suggest a device for performing a power off step where the power source is "turned off after completion of the writing." Thus, the cited references, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest every element of claim 5 and claim 5 is not obvious over the cited references. Claims 6-10 and 28 are dependent upon claim 5 and thus include every limitation of claim 5. Therefore, claims 6-10 and 28 are also not obvious over the cited references.

Also in contrast to the cited references, claim 11 includes:

> a controller which, when the first input member is operated while writing on the display is being performed, invalidates the command sent from the first input member and, when the first input member is operated after completion of the writing, controls the electronic information device in accordance with the command sent from the first input member;

The cited references do not show or suggest invalidating any command sent from an input member. The Office Action cites the suspend switch 410 as meeting this element. However, this is completely inapposite. There is no description in Yamazaki of this Suspend SW. Utility 410. From Figure 4, it is apparent that there is a switch to manually enter the suspended state (403). There is no hint in the reference that any command issued

in response to pressing this switch is inhibited, invalidated or otherwise affected by the display operation. Therefore, the cited references do not show or suggest a device for performing a command from an input member that "when the first input member is operated while writing on the display is being performed, invalidates the command sent from the first input member." Thus, the cited references, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest every element of claim 11 and claim 11 is not obvious over the cited references. Claims 12-14 are dependent upon claim 11 and thus include every limitation of claim 11. Therefore, claims 12-14 are also not obvious over the cited references.

Also in contrast to the cited references, claim 15 includes:

> commanding a power-off of the electric power source; and
> when a power-off of the electric power source is commanded while the display is performing writing by consuming electric power supplied from the electric power source, executing the power-off command after completion of the writing without requiring a second power-off command;

As noted above, the cited references do not show or suggest more than one power off command in a single process. The process of Figure 7 of Yamazaki is an improvement on the process of Figure 5. Figure 7 is not a subroutine called by any step of Figure 5. The only power off commands shown in Yamazaki are steps 78 and 57 at the end of those respective processes, and implied by the power off state 404.

Also as noted above, even if it is conceded for the sake of argument that the process of Figure 7 is somehow triggered by a power-off command, the process still does not show all of the elements of the claim. Claim 15 requires that the device "executing the power-off command after completion of the writing." When writing is detected in Yamazaki, the timer is reset at step 74. This begins an entirely new cycle of checking the keyboard and video operation. The process of Figure 7 has no way of determining if a particular writing process is completed. If another keystroke occurs, the timer will be reset. If another writing process occurs, the timer will be reset. The only thing that the process of Figure 7 determines is that there has been no keystroke or video memory write

within a specified time. This does not show or suggest the limitations of the claim. Therefore, the cited references do not show or suggest each limitation of claim 15 and claim 15 is not obvious over the cited references. Claims 16-18 are dependent upon claim 15 and thus include every limitation of claim 15. Therefore, claims 16-18 are also not obvious over the cited references.

Also in contrast to the cited references, claim 19 includes:

> a delay step of, when writing on the display is being performed, delaying execution of the power-off step so that the electric power source is turned off after completion of the writing;

The cited references do not show all of the elements of the claim. Claim 19 requires that the device "delaying execution of the power-off step so that the electric power source is turned off after completion of the writing." When writing is detected in Yamazaki, the timer is reset at step 74. This begins an entirely new cycle of checking the keyboard and video operation. The process of Figure 7 has no way of determining if a particular writing process is completed. If another keystroke occurs, the timer will be reset. If another writing process occurs, the timer will be reset. The only thing that the process of Figure 7 determines is that there has been no keystroke or video memory write within a specified time. This does not show or suggest the limitations of the claim. Therefore, the cited references do not show or suggest each limitation of claim 19 and claim 19 is not obvious over the cited references. Claims 20-23 and 29 are dependent upon claim 19 and thus include every limitation of claim 19. Therefore, claims 20-23 and 29 are also not obvious over the cited references.

Also in contrast to the cited references, claim 24 includes the steps of:

> issuing a specified command by operating a first input member; and when the first input member is operated while writing on the display is being performed, invalidating the command sent from the first input member, and, when the first input member is operated after completion of

the writing, controlling the electronic information device in accordance with the command sent from the first input member;

As noted above, the cited references do not show or suggest invalidating any command send from an input member. The Office Action cites the suspend switch 410 as meeting this element. However, this is completely inapposite. There is no description in Yamazaki of this Suspend SW. Utility 410. From Figure 4, it is apparent that there is a switch to manually enter the suspended state (403). There is no hint in the reference that any command issued in response to pressing this switch is inhibited, invalidated or otherwise affected by the display operation. Therefore, the cited references do not show or suggest a device for performing a command from an input member that "when the first input member is operated while writing on the display is being performed, invalidates the command sent from the first input member." Thus, the cited references, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest every element of claim 24 and claim 24 is not obvious over the cited references. Claims 25-27 are dependent upon claim 24 and thus include every limitation of claim 24. Therefore, claims 25-27 are also not obvious over the cited references.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki in view of Matsuzaki, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Wherefore, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is considered to be in condition for allowance, and an early reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

This Amendment does not increase the number of independent claims, does not increase the total number of claims, and does not present any multiple dependency claims. Accordingly, no fee based on the number or type of claims is currently due. However, if a

fee, other than the issue fee, is due, please charge this fee to Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP's Deposit Account No. 18-1260.

Any fee required by this document other than the issue fee, and not submitted herewith should be charged to Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP's Deposit Account No. 18-1260. Any refund should be credited to the same account.

If an extension of time is required to enable this document to be timely filed and there is no separate Petition for Extension of Time filed herewith, this document is to be construed as also constituting a Petition for Extension of Time Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) for a period of time sufficient to enable this document to be timely filed.

Any other fee required for such Petition for Extension of Time and any other fee required by this document pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17, other than the issue fee, and not submitted herewith should be charged to Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP's Deposit Account No. 18-1260. Any refund should be credited to the same account.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____

Douglas A. Sorensen
Registration No. 31,570
Attorney for Applicants

DAS/rb:jkk
SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD LLP
717 N. Harwood, Suite 3400
Dallas, Texas 75201
Direct: (214) 981-3482
Main: (214) 981-3300
Facsimile: (214) 981-3400
June 16, 2005